

**SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN**

THURSDAY, MAY 6TH, 2004

Representatives Present: Cynthia Murray, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Steve Kinsey, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Annette Rose, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Bruce Sams, Belvedere City Council
Joan Lundstrom, Larkspur City Council
Al Boro, San Rafael City Council
Alice Fredericks, Tiburon Town Council
Dick Swanson, Mill Valley City Council
Pat Eklund, Novato City Council
Melissa Gill, Corte Madera Town Council
Peter Breen, San Anselmo Town Council
Amy Belser, Sausalito City Council

Representatives Absent: Hal Brown, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Susan Adams, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Lew Tremaine, Fairfax Town Council
Tom Byrnes, Ross Town Council

Staff Members Present: Craig Tackabery, CMA Executive Director
Dean Powell, Principal Transportation Planner, Marin County DPW
Amy Van Doren, Marin County Transit District Manager
Art Brook, Transportation Engineer, Marin County DPW
Jack Baker, Senior Civil Engineer, Marin County DPW
Jason Nutt, Traffic Operations Engineer, Marin County DPW
Tho Do, Associate Civil Engineer, Marin County DPW
JeriLynne Stewart, Recording Secretary

Chairman Kinsey called the Transportation Authority of Marin Meeting to order at 7:45 p.m.

- 1) Transportation Authority of Marin – First Meeting Business:
 - a. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Commissioner Murray motioned to nominate Commissioner Kinsey as Chairman and Commissioner Boro as Vice Chairman. Commissioner Gill seconded the motion. Motion passed 13/0/0.

- b. Selection of Terms by Lot

Dean Powell explained it was recommended by the Governance Subcommittee we draw by lot for 3 Commissioners from the Board of Supervisors for the initial 4-year term, and the other two

Commissioners from the Board of Supervisors will serve two-year terms. From the City and Town Councils, five will serve the initial 4-year term, and six will serve two-year terms.

Supervisor Murray, Supervisor Rose, and Supervisor Kinsey will all serve the initial 4-year term as Commissioners; Supervisors Adams and Brown will serve two-year terms.

Representatives from the following cities and towns will serve for the following terms:

City/Town	Term (in years)
Belvedere	2
Corte Madera	2
Fairfax	4
Larkspur	2
Mill Valley	2
Novato	4
Ross	2
San Anselmo	4
San Rafael	4
Sausalito	2
Tiburon	4

c. Adopt Meeting Schedule

Commissioner Eklund motioned to adopt the schedule as written. Commissioner Belser seconded the motion. Motion passed 12/0/0.

- d. As An Interim Administrative Measure, Adopt Robert's Rules of Order for Procedures and Adhere to The Brown Act and Administrative Provisions for Local Transportation Authorities Contained in CA Public Utilities Code Sections 180000 et. Seq.

Commissioner Belser motioned to adopt the interim procedures set forth above. Commissioner Eklund seconded the motion. Motion passed 12/0/0.

- e. As An Interim Staffing Measure, Maintain the Existing Contractual Relationship with County Staff As Agreed To In The existing Countywide Planning Agency/Congestion Management Agency Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement

Commissioner Breen motioned to maintain the existing relationship with County Staff. Commissioner Fredericks seconded the motion. Motion passed 12/0/0.

2) Commissioner Matters Not On the Agenda

None.

3) Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Craig Tackabery reported on AB 2001, the double fine zone in school zones. Yesterday, Jason Nutt attended the Assembly Appropriations Hearing; it passed. Now, the Bill goes on to the Assembly floor.

4) Adopt Regional Transportation Plan (Transportation 2030) Project List

Executive Director Tackabery reported that at the March meeting, we discussed a draft project list; MCBC made comments on the allocations, and staff has incorporated the information and allocations to reflect their suggestions. In addition, Caltrans e-mailed with a recommendation, which we have incorporated to increase the funding for operational system improvements. The Staff Report summarizes the community outreach. The outreach group with which we worked requested more funding to be spent on transit capital. At this time, Staff recommends we not revise

the percentages and wait to see what happens in November with the transportation sales tax before considering a change.

Commissioner Eklund questioned the statement on page 3, "Alternate funding screening", that "Caltrans contends that these projects are a more efficient use of funds than the Nave Drive Auxiliary Lane Project 436..." by asking if the funds have been shifted. Executive Director Tackabery said what we had before were funds which allowed only the planning of the project. In their e-mail, Caltrans recommended that until they took a better look at the intersection of Highway 101 and Highway 580, it would not make sense to begin planning a project at Nave Drive. They preferred we put our limited money into system operations. Between last draft and the draft presented tonight, we moved about \$2M into system operations. Mr. Tackabery explained there is no money available at this time to begin planning Project 436 (Nave Auxiliary Lane).

The \$2M for system operations (refer to Attachment D, Project 159 and 160) will go into ramp metering, TOS, fiber optics, which were items described at our last meeting by Caltrans. It is money to make the system work efficiently.

Commissioner Gill, referencing the "U.S. 101/Greenbrae Interchange," asked if the project is to include a study to and including Tamalpais Avenue overcrossing; does this need clarification? Mr. Tackabery said this is verbatim from the ballot measure.

Chairman Kinsey said the study area does in fact include the Tamalpais Avenue overcrossing. He requested Staff work to reflect this clarification.

David Schoenbrunn, TRANSDEF, said the submission for the Regional Transportation Plan is one of the two most significant votes the Authority will take within the next 3 years. This, plus the State Transportation Improvement Plan are the two major decisions made by the CMA. He said there has never been a process of priority setting by this Board. This list has come through Caltrans and the DPWs without ever having had political discussion for prioritization.

Mr. Schoenbrunn said Project 436 may very well be ill conceived as it cannot be fixed. There is a real disconnect in the decision-making process within the CMA regarding this Project. He said there is no operational need for this project. He urged the Authority to set its priorities; what does the Authority wish to see happen? He urged the Authority, again, to glean a process.

Chairman Kinsey stated these projects are a reflection of the Congestion Management Program, which has identified the Marin Sonoma Narrows as the next segment of the Highway 101 corridor we wish to address after the Gap Closure. We agreed, as the CMA, with the adoption of the Sales Tax Expenditure Plan, if it is successful, it sets the stage for what we've agreed will be a significant review of the Congestion Management Program and a rewrite of that document for its next adoption, so that it reflects all modes.

Commissioner Fredericks motioned to adopt the RTP (2030). Commissioner Boro seconded the motion. Motion passed 12/0/0.

- 5) Adopt Resolution Approving Initial Project Report for Regional Measure 2 – US 101 Greenbrae Interchange/Larkspur Ferry Access Improvements

Staff recommended the Authority consider the enclosed materials and adopt the attached resolution approving the Initial Project Report, requesting \$4,083,000 in RM-2 funding for environmental review and supporting preliminary engineering in FY 04/05. Executive Director Tackabery said the basic intent was to show what money we would need next year, and to show that the projects we are asking for are fully funded. We had a short time-line to pull this together. MCBC looked at this very closely. The ferry-access funds were overstated; we will modify those. The shortfall now is \$2.2M; the Plan showed it at \$5M. We broke the ballot measure language into 4 projects, to ensure flexibility. Since we did not have enough money for the ferry project, we broke that down into phases, for further flexibility.

Commissioner Rose said there was a typo in the title of the Resolution; on page 2 of 11, under "Impediments To Completion," there is a listing of other agencies which require reviews and clearances yet BCDC is not mentioned, which, she felt, needs to be listed.

Commissioner Gill asked why it is necessary to break down the project into 4 different pieces. Executive Director Tackabery said that we need the project to be fully funded before we work on it, and these projects are all independent; broken down, it allows the projects more flexibility to each go at a different pace; start independent plans, get independent environmental documents, etc. We can combine them later, if we would like to build them together. Throughout the document, Commissioner Gill asked that wherever it states, "... from Tamalpais Drive to Sir Francis Drake..." it needs to be clear that it includes the Tamalpais OverCrossing. Moreover, on the Contact List on page 11, Commissioner Gill requested the addition of Corte Madera.

Commissioner Lundstrom said on the first page it does not list the Town of Corte Madera, and elsewhere it does not list Larkspur. She asked Staff to include both in conjunction with the Greenbrae Interchange, stating it is important they are both listed for the EIR. As the cities and towns are at the initial scoping phases, she said people may not realize that the cost of this is just a very rough estimate, and that the cost can go higher due to the complexity of the project.

Commissioner Eklund asked what other projects were part of Regional Measure 2 (for Marin County). Executive Director Craig Tackabery and Commissioner Kinsey explained there was Express Bus service over the Richmond Bridge, the SMART Extension, and the Greenbrae Multi-Modal Project.

Commissioner Boro referred to two charts within RM-2: page 6 shows \$65M total and page 10 shows \$73.9M. He was specifically interested in Cal Park Tunnel. He questioned if about \$10M was coming from RM-2 money. He said he saw that approximately \$3M was for design; he was attempting to make the numbers work. Mr. Tackabery said the \$550K is BTA (a different funding source) on page 10; and, the \$2358 is a combination of BTA and TEA. Commissioner Boro asked if \$12,986,000 was the total cost for the Cal Park Hill project. Mr. Tackabery said yes, this is a conservative estimate coming out of the 30% design review which is currently being evaluated to reduce the cost. Commissioner Boro then asked if the difference between the \$65M and the \$73M is other pieces like this, other sources, combined with the Measure 2 money. Mr. Tackabery responded that he was correct.

Karen Nygren with Sierra Club said she supported this project. She questioned how much flexibility is within the phases of the money suggested. She said there are 5-7 different alternatives of this plan, with different approaches. As a governing body, she said TAM has not seen the design; TAM does not know which alternative it would be choosing. She noted the East-West corridor on SFD is one that needs improvement between Larkspur Landing and to Bon Air Shopping Center; that issue does not appear to be addressed in any of the alternatives. She is asking TAM to give some language within its adoption of this which allows for flexibility in case TAM needs to change funding.

Mr. Schoenbrunn, TRANSDEF, said this project is before TAM not because the body has thought "What is our highest priority project", but because 3 jurisdictions got together to put it together, and "jammed it through" the governing body at 11pm. There's never been a serious discussion from this governing body what it would like its funding from RM-2 to do. Mr. Schoenbrunn said he presented an alternative to this project. Refer to #2, "Eliminate the need for northbound traffic entering the Highway..." He said the on-ramp traffic which goes down the ramp, through the traffic light is what is causing the problem. He proposes to close off that on-ramp to northbound Highway 101 traffic, and save \$48M, and put that into something else TAM would rather have.

Deb Hubsmith of MCBC, thanked Larkspur for their support in the above Ferry Connection which is at 30% design now, and thanked the County for the Cal Park Hill Tunnel Project at 30% design.

Commissioner Boro said he did not feel the governing body has the latitude to say we can use this money elsewhere. He said RM-2 specifically called for this improvement. Mr. Tackabery said that if there is excess money, there is a reallocation process, of which MTC would be in charge. Chairman Kinsey said that a goal would be to keep it within a corridor, although there is no requirement to do so.

Chairman Kinsey explained that the Greenbrae Interchange Project has been long-standing, long-identified priority project for the CMA, and reflected in its Congestion Management Program (CMP) for a significant number of years. It was deferred for some time, to allow for CMA funds to study the Redwood Landfill issue; then, it was put back on track and has been tediously and slowly moving along. Yet, the slow pace allowed it to be devised in a way that Larkspur and Corte Madera were able to see their self-interests, in issues around Tamalpais, Greenbrae Interchange, and the Wornum Drive area to come to consensus as local communities.

Commissioner Lundstrom said Corte Madera and Larkspur had a historic joint meeting and they made some preliminary decisions just to get to this point. Corte Madera agreed to close Fifer Drive on/off ramp, and Larkspur agreed to close Industrial Drive. They were shown a number of alternatives. They agreed to have a new Wornum Drive intersection and that the Madera off-ramp would still be there. Commissioner Lundstrom said a quarter-million dollars was spent on engineering funds about 3 years ago to bring us to this point. Now we have to work with local roads and accommodate bicycles and pedestrians.

Commissioner Boro motioned to adopt the attached resolution approving the Initial Project Report as amended, including Tamalpais OverCrossing wherever it states, "... from Tamalpais Drive to Sir Francis Drake...". Commissioner Lundstrom seconded the motion. Motion passed 12/0/0.

Commissioner Rose said it has been a long-time coming for the agreement between Larkspur and Corte Madera and the County to look at a project like this. She said it was wonderful to get it funded with bridge tolls. She pointed out that there will be an EIR, and because of the importance of this interchange to everyone in the County, that all of the cities and the Supervisors pay close attention to the designs and the alternatives. She commended the three champions who brought this forward to this point.

6) Open Time for Items Not On the Agenda

None.

Chairman Kinsey adjourned the TAM meeting at 8:35 p.m.

**SPECIAL JOINT MEETING OF THE
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN,
AND MARIN COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT**

THURSDAY, MAY 6TH, 2004

Representatives Present: Cynthia Murray, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Steve Kinsey, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Annette Rose, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Bruce Sams, Belvedere City Council
Joan Lundstrom, Larkspur City Council
Al Boro, San Rafael City Council
Alice Fredericks, Tiburon Town Council
Dick Swanson, Mill Valley City Council
Pat Eklund, Novato City Council
Melissa Gill, Corte Madera Town Council
Peter Breen, San Anselmo Town Council
Amy Belser, Sausalito City Council
Barbara Heller, Marin County Transit District

Representatives Absent: Hal Brown, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Susan Adams, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Lew Tremaine, Fairfax Town Council
Tom Byrnes, Ross Town Council

Staff Members Present: Craig Tackabery, TAM Executive Director
Dean Powell, Principal Transportation Planner, Marin County DPW
Amy Van Doren, Marin County Transit District Manager
Art Brook, Transportation Engineer, Marin County DPW
Jack Baker, Senior Civil Engineer, Marin County DPW
Jason Nutt, Traffic Operations Engineer, Marin County DPW
Tho Do, Associate Civil Engineer, Marin County DPW
JeriLynne Stewart, Recording Secretary

Chairman Kinsey called the Joint Meeting of the Transportation Authority of Marin and Marin County Transit District to order at 8:36 p.m.

Chairman Kinsey began the meeting by explaining that the Transit District is the agency responsible for bus transit services within Marin County. It was created by a vote of the people. It receives a variety of revenue sources but its most significant are a portion of the property tax. There have been discussions as we worked on the Expenditure Plan as to whether or not the Transit District could be folded into the Transportation Authority. It would require a vote of the people. The property taxes which are identified for the Transit District would not automatically follow over into the Transportation Authority. Therefore, the Transit District remains an independent agency.

The Transit District has historically negotiated agreements with GGBH&TD for our local bus service. It is currently involved in negotiations with the GGBH&TD about the maintenance and improvement of local bus services. The Transit District is comprised of the 5 members of the Board of Supervisors and two members of the Mayors and Council Members; currently Dick Swanson and Barbara Heller. The significant issues involved in our existing bus services in this County are important to this entire agency. Chairman Kinsey said he will be agendizing more information coming forward in the next few months to begin to get the entire Transportation Authority and the public to become aware of the issues which face the Transit District, and better understand the challenges it faces. If we are successful with our Sales Tax Measure, we need to focus on how the relationship between the Transportation Authority and the Transit District will function.

- a. Approve Plan and Direct Staff to Present the Plan To the Board of Supervisors and All Marin City and Town Councils for Approval

7) Final Draft of Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure

Executive Director Tackabery commended everyone for their hard work on this Draft. Last Thursday night, the governing body gave Staff modifications which are included in the written copies tonight. He referred to the Supplemental Packet for minor errata and changes suggested by the public.

Bonnie Nelson of Nelson/Nygaard reviewed the errata and editing proposed. Ms. Nelson complimented the hard work everyone contributed to the editing efforts within the past week. In reviewing the final draft ourselves, we found a number of minor changes, which are included in the packets tonight as errata; most are wording or spelling changes.

Refer to #7 on the errata list; allocation of infrastructure funds to local jurisdictions. Staff had not, in the Plan, said that those funds would be distributed on an annual basis; we have added the words "...on an annual basis" for clarity. Refer to page 23; correction regarding the sidebar, the list of high priority roads with crossing guards, which will be corrected. Ms. Nelson pointed out two items from the public on the errata list; #11 (page 26 of Plan); we'd said the Strategic Plan would be approved by the Authority, after a Noticed Public Hearing, yet Staff did not indicate if it would be by a simple or super majority; the language is amended to indicate a "super majority." Refer to #13 (page 30 of Plan); where there might be one element of a strategy that is overfunded, so that money could be moved to another element of the same Strategy; Staff did not indicate if it would be by a simple or super majority; the language is amended to indicate a "super majority." Karen Nygren made the initial request for this, yet was not alone in her request.

Staff attended the Go Marin Go meeting today and presented the plan, where one of the members raised a question about assumptions regarding bonding. This is on page 2 of Plan. In the discussion in the last paragraph about how much money the Sales Tax will generate, we want to clarify that the \$16.5M average per year over 20-years is net of expenses for administration and bonding. We've added a footnote just for calculation that the gross Sales Tax projection is \$19.6M annually and the Plan assumes a \$30M bond issued the first year, and annual 5% administrative cost.

Chairman Kinsey noted that the reality is no decisions have been made; this is an assumption on the amount of a bond. When to bond and how much to bond, would all be addressed in the Strategic Plan process. When we do make those decisions, as to what to bond, etc., the cost of that bond could be clearly identified. If we chose to, we could assign the costs to the Strategy in which it's being allocated.

Commissioner Swanson, regarding administration bonding, said bonding is not an expense, debt service or issuance costs are; by point of clarification, if this is going to be included, state that bonding refers to debt service and issuance costs. He further suggests Staff identify what the debt service its assumed is; the dollar amount.

Commissioner Gill had a suggestion on the glossary for leveraging: she'd like to see inserted on page G-1 "... on a one-to-one or other percentage basis with other funds..." "Matching sounds like 'one-to-one', and it's not always the case.

Commissioner Eklund asked about "super majority / 2/3"; that it's redundant. Ms. Nelson explained that you could have just 2/3, but you couldn't have just "super majority," since a "super majority" could apply to 75% for example. Both are used for extra clarity. Commissioner Eklund asked if it's a 'super majority' of 2/3. Ms. Nelson said we could just state "...2/3 vote" if the Authority desired. Commissioner Eklund felt there would be confusion if both terms were used. Pages 6 & 8 refers to Transit District providing a short-range Transit Plan once every 2-years; it may be helpful to state that there will be an annual report. Ms. Nelson noted that in response to Commissioner Eklund's e-mail, an addition was made to the last sentence on the page stating "...updated performance data will be provided annually". Commissioner Eklund asked if it could include "... to the Authority". With reference to "professional crossing guards", is Staff referring to paid crossing guards? Ms. Nelson, with reference to page 23, said the discussion about contracting is in reference to what other counties have done. We specifically did not indicate whether we'd be contracting or hiring. The use of the word "professional" is to imply they are trained to provide safety for children, not that they are from an outside firm. Commissioner Eklund wanted the passage to state "... trained" instead of "professional". Commissioner Eklund

then said on page 23, "... the intersections will be prioritized by the Public Works Directors together with the TAC..." She asked then at what point can the Safe Routes to Schools committees in each of the communities provide input. Craig Tackabery said it is addressing on the bottom paragraph of page 21, where it talks about the whole program together. Ms. Nelson quoted, "The programs and the strategy will be addressed every 2-years by the TAC through a public process involving parents, school officials, and students." This group will be included in the process of all the Safe Routes programs. Commissioner Eklund finally asked how the money is to be distributed; on the provide safer access to schools portion. Ms. Nelson responded the County's going to administer the program, ensuring geographic equity and said the projects that come up from the individual school committees in each part of the County, are assessed for prioritization. Currently, the SR2S Staff helps to write grants, for example, that would continue to be the case, thereby schools receive individual attention from the program. Commissioner Eklund asked if the governing body would be able to approve what is being recommended for funding. Ms. Nelson responded that the body has not only the ability but also the requirement to approve expenditures of sales tax funds.

Commissioner Murray, referring to page ES-1, said it's important to stress in the last paragraph, "...that the money can *only* be spent for transportation". Next page, top, there should be something stating "... this money can not be taken by the State". ES-2, last sentence, 2nd paragraph: using the words "setting" and "set" in the same sentence needs changing. Use "...allow us to determine". Referring to the chart on ES-3: it's really important to state that the money that's in there for the Highway 101 HOV Lane/Gap Closure is fully funding." It should say",... Fully fund, ensure an accelerate completion of Highway 101, "as opposed to timely." In addition, on the chart, it does not say that 1) the percentages are approximations, and 2), it is net. Ms. Nelson said the percentages are not approximations; the dollar amount are approximations, or estimations.

Joy Dahlgren with Marin Citizen for Effective Transportation, referred to the April 8th meeting's adoption of performance measures. She requested they be included in the Plan. Ms. Dahlgren felt the text is too long and promotional enough to turn voters off.

David Schoenbrunn questioned the 1% cap on administrative employees' salaries and benefits. There is reference on a handout about a 5% administrative cost; why the 4% difference? Does that have to do with Professional Staff? A clarification is needed. Bonnie Nelson said the law limits a body to spending 1% of the funds collected by the measure on salaries. What is included in the 5%, which is based on expenditures of other authorities, are legal services, rent, professional consulting services, outside counsel, etc. Mr. Schoenbrunn then said the governing body is going to need to get a statement from the consultants in terms of the list of transit services; how much can we actually afford? He said he could not evaluate how much of this we can make work with available funds. For purposes of credibility, he felt it important this be grounded.

Margaret Petnanzigo referred to page 20, asked to strike the word "...feasible" in that this often precludes anything happening. She would like to add "...no parking signing" in the 1st paragraph, next to the last line, because unless there are no parking signs, people will park in bike lanes, and yet they won't be cited under the Vehicle Code.

Alex Foreman, Chairman, Sierra Club, Marin Group, thanked the Authority and the MCTD for coming up with a plan most of Marin can get behind, particularly for adopting the governance changes requiring a 2/3 vote. The Sierra Club worked hard on Measures A & B, and took a lot of heat for supporting that; people did not trust that their money would be spent as the Measure had said. This time, the money will be spent the way it is intended. He will work toward seeing the Measure pass.

David Pilpel referred to the amount of bonding discussed earlier, and said the Public Utilities Code requires the maximum amount of bonding to be included in the Plan. Would it not be prudent, to include the maximum amount, to address confidence issues stated earlier by Dick Swanson? Craig Tackabery said we could discuss it later, when we get to the Ordinance, and the PUC section Mr. Pilpel is referring to is the section San Francisco uses; not the section we are using. Mr. Pilpel said with regard to page 10, maintenance of effort with the GGBH&TD, he has concerns about "...provide that the District maintains the toll revenue that currently funds these regional services ..." It is not clear what it meant by "...maintains the toll revenue..." Is that an amount, a percentage, a level of service? It is difficult to understand this amount considering short-range transit plans. In the San Francisco Plan, an appendix noted not just the public

members that served on the Advisory Committee, but also members of the Board who helped craft it. It might be worth considering printing all of this Board's names and the Board's predecessor names, plus the names of the 5 Community Advisory Committees, especially for recording purposes.

Karen Nygren said she is impressed by the responsiveness of this group and the Staff. She said the side bars are filled with very important information and possibly, asterisks or arrows could be included in the text indicating a note, or, to point to that particular side-bar.

Commissioner Swanson said bond issues are only issued for specific projects. You cannot issue bonds for something that is hypothetical. The only two projects in this Plan which would qualify would be Gap Closure and/or Transit capital. If you know the amounts, from a cash flow analysis, of the shortfall necessary to fund the Gap Closure, that defines the amount of the bonds to be issued. There has been no discussion about capitalizing interest on these bonds. The amount is defined by a specific, cash flow amount of a particular shortfall on a project. Bonnie Nelson said we know the shortfall amount of the Gap Closure today; we also know that between now and November, Staff is working very hard to reduce that shortfall. On the infrastructure funds, the DPW Directors could come together and develop their first set of priorities which might include a major project on SFD Blvd, for example, that they might then want to bond funding for, which could be done immediately. Commissioner Swanson said those numbers are variable within a very small range.

Chairman Kinsey said \$30M would be an appropriate number to provide us with flexibility. He said he would disagree with the fact that it would be limited to just the Gap Closure. There has been some discussion of bonding for the Safe Pathway Programs. This represents the value of putting together a Strategic Plan. Some communities may want to commit certain dollars to a bonding program; we have developed estimates that will allow for \$30M, and still fall among the targets we have for the amount that could be generated from a sales tax. We're leaving the specific discussion to the Strategic Plan and it will be this Authority making the decision. Regarding clarification of the MCTD's bus service: we are working on an agreement with the current provider of bus service for the existing local service. He asked Bonnie Nelson and Craig Tackabery to define more specifically how much of the identified bus service we'll be able to actually achieve under the Plan, as opposed to those that are eligible. Ms. Nelson said we are in the midst of negotiations with GGBH&TD; we do not know how much the existing service is going to cost us to maintain over the next year. We have defined a short-ranged transit plan and process that will help us make those judgments. She said that over the life of the Plan, we will get to many of the things that are on the list; yet, the specific priorities could change over 20 years. Chairman Kinsey spoke of possible partner funding from cities and towns and other funding programs, like Prop 42, which could have an impact. Ms. Nelson said we are awaiting reauthorization of our federal legislation right now, which comes up periodically over the life of the Plan.

Pertaining to the Maintenance of Effort portion of Plan, Ms. Nelson said the language in the errata sheet was painfully crafted after discussions with GGBH&TD's staff and General Manager. We have made our intent clear. It is not just to maintain the dollars going to the service but the value of those tolls to the regional service. Our intent is not just to preserve a dollar amount in 2004 that does not escalate for 20 years, but to preserve the value to the regional system.

Ms. Nelson stated the Authority will take an action to finally adopt the Plan after the cities and towns have approved it.

Peter Breen said we worked extremely hard to bring the CAC's together, and those CAC's represent a very broad base of our community and participants who worked long on this matter, and would work hard on its passage. One page of Acknowledgements in reasonably sized print will move people to see if their name is on it; it is a sound investment. Supervisor Rose also agrees there needs to be an additional page of Acknowledgements. Each of us who appointed people to those committees need to ask their permission to have their names printed, because it is an implied endorsement. Commissioner Kinsey said we actually do not have that kind of time to pursue the suggestion to meet our schedule.

Regarding further verbiage concerns raised on page 20, until environmental and engineering studies have been done, to not include the term "...where feasible" would be making a promise that I am not sure the Authority can keep. Commissioner Rose used Alexander Avenue and Bridgeway as an example; how would a bike path be constructed there, without taking out the houses? Craig Tackabery said regarding the 2nd sentence, we could include "...stripping and signing *for* bicycle lanes..." which makes it a bit broader.

Commissioner Murray had the following suggestions for revision: page 9, it's important to say "... senior or accessible friendly neighborhood-scaled shuttles"; page 12, last paragraph, need to add the word "...disabled"; page 14, did we agree upon putting in "...fully funded and ensure speedy completion of Highway 101"; Strategy 3, page 16, it would be good to say something about public safety & improves response time, maybe a "bullet" point; page 18, last paragraph, it says "... this distribution will be balanced every 5 years..." yet in our strategic plan, we say "...every 2 years". Rebalancing the money every 6 years makes sense. Ms. Nelson pointed to a footnote added to page 20; we could use the same footnote for the figure 2 on page 18. She said we would update the formula every 6 years. Ms. Nelson said these funds are for major road projects; 2 years is not long enough to have completed projects.

Chairman Kinsey asked staff to add an asterisk indicating "...these are the numbers which will be adjusted to reflect the most recent numbers as of January, 2005 and revisited every 6 years". Ms. Nelson said the formula is based on population and road mileage data. Percentages will be reviewed at the start of tax collection and adjusted to reflect the most current information on that date.

Commissioner Swanson observed that his council agreed to assist in revising the Plan; how to improve it and how to advocate for it. Although all of us want to improve it, we felt the ability to do that is somewhat compromised because we cannot tell the residents of Mill Valley what they're going to get from the sales tax when it comes to local transit; 37% of where the money's going to go. He suggested more specificity be provided. Yet, it's unfortunate; the Mill Valley City Council wants to support and advocate for the Plan, yet we can't tell constituents what the 37% of funding really means; a big chunk of the Plan is ill-defined.

Commissioner Lundstrom said the Plan, over 20-years, gives all city/town council members, present, and future, more flexibility; they can make those tough decisions over that period. Our responsibility is to interpret how we might use those funds locally.

Commissioner Belser said the Sausalito Council felt the Plan has vastly improved since the last meeting; it is reflective of public input and the polling. The flexibility of time allows us to control what happens.

Commissioner Murray offered more suggestions: page 29 #4, contradicts what we have said; delete the last phrase. The language should be similar to ES-2. If this were to be user-friendly, we need photos and illustrations to give it vitality & make it warm; like the Countywide Plan. She questioned on page 31 #12, the term, "...new cities". Ms. Nelson said we can use "...new cities and incorporated towns".

Mr. Shoenbrunn said page 10 of errata, "...to preserve values of toll subsidies..." follows a "not" and "sales tax funds". It does not read properly; therefore, restate, "... are to preserve the value of toll subsidies to regional routes and sales tax funds are not used to replace ... "

Margaret, on page 9, said there's a work-dependent neighborhood not listed. Ms. Nelson said the Canal would not be a small-scaled shuttle neighborhood due to high ridership.

Joy Dahlgren, wording on page 8, 3rd paragraph, could say, "... all transit investments will be evaluated based on an analysis of the performance-based criteria listed on the sidebar on page 6". Same thing on page 18.

Chairman Kinsey acknowledged a long listing of groups, communities, and individuals working together to contribute to this Plan's process, completion, and success for our future and our quality of life.

Commissioner Murray motioned to adopt the final plan with the identified errata and other changes that have been made as listed above. Commissioner Boro seconded the motion.

Commissioner Eklund said Novato City Council had a lot of comments about the completion of the Gap Closure and concerns about performance measures. The Council was concerned about having adequate funding for transit. It is unclear what we are going to get for the transit money, and if the amount of money set-aside is sufficient for our transit

system. I will support the motion to send this to the city councils for their review and action. I am still, as is Novato council, very concerned about the amount of money going to roads. Our local measure, passed in 1989 and again in 2000, each for a \$15M bond over an 11-year period. In some respects, this could compromise our ability to go for another bond; it may give the impression that the sales tax measure is supposed to fix all of our streets. She is also concerned about the relationship between MCTD and TAM.

Commissioner Boro said this is a countywide Transportation Authority, and we are looking at this Plan from a countywide point of view. He agreed there are questions about the transit portion of this issue. We know that Supervisors Kinsey and Rose are working with their counterparts at GGBH&TD to come to an agreement; that will come. The intent is to sustain and enhance a transportation system we currently have in place. No one can predict anything right now; things are different today than they were 3 years ago; they will be different again 2 years from now. We have spent a lot of time on this Plan, gleaned the efforts and input of people like Dick Swanson and the CAC's. We need to go to our councils and ask if this is going to serve the needs of the county. It is like the Highway 101 corridor: it is one road for an entire region, not just a road in Marin County. This Plan is a Plan for the entire county, not just one city.

Chairman Kinsey reported he went to MTC to ask them to provide the breakdown of sales tax expenditure plan for all of the counties who have passed them. With the exception of San Francisco, Marin County's expenditure Plan has the highest amount of money allocated to transit of any of the other counties. We are making a substantial commitment to transit as part of our future.

Motion passed 13/0/0.

b. Report on Outreach and Education

1. Website Demonstration

Dave Hyams of Solem Associates presented a website demonstration, detailing how to navigate it, etc. He cautioned not to look at it for content as we will be making changes reflective of tonight's changes. In the red on the left are the 4 Strategies; click on one of those, you go to that Strategy. This is the language from the Plan, placed in digestible form. Referring to the icons; if for example, you click on the 'bus' it takes you to the Transit Strategy; if you click on the 'bike' it takes you to the infrastructure Strategy. There is a section on Overview; in "Your Area" it becomes a drop-down map of the area you are interested in.

This will be up and running by the end of next week. They want to give it a thorough test prior to going live. Marintraffic.org points directly to the new site, and it will have its own website which you can get to in other ways. "Sales Tax Expenditure Plan" will be the log-on/key. Mr. Hyams said it would be easy to include a listing of acknowledgements on a web page, if desired.

2. Direct Mail Overview

This piece is strictly informative, and is not a campaign piece in any way. Mr. Hyams said this is a chance for the Authority to speak directly to the citizens in a straightforward report. The sheet is to be folded in thirds. As far as recipients of this piece are concerned, Mr. Hyams said they are working with the County Purchasing Division about non-profit mail permits. The universe of recipients would be dictated by cost. We want to send it out like a mailer via bulk mailing.

Chairman Kinsey reported he asked MTC if they would provide financial support to this, as an educational piece. They gave a positive response.

Commissioner Fredericks had concern about referring to the 26.5% as being "...local roads". Not only is that a flashpoint, it understates what the funds are going to be used for. It is to manage local infrastructure, and roads is only one component of that. Commissioner Eklund said Mr. Hyams could use arrows, to indicate connection. She asked when it would be distributed. Mr. Hyams said when they iron-out funding and mailing procedures, and before the city council meetings begin to take action on the Plan.

Commissioner Murray wanted more journalistic headlines. She said to state "...Plan reflects concerns of cities and towns." There's a lot of wordsmithing needed: say, "...summer" not this year; include "...cities, towns and the County"; include "...the BOS" because we approved it, too; 3rd section, say "...and report directly." "Poll finds *solid* support for Sales Tax Expenditure Plan."

Commissioner Rose said the 3rd bullet, "...cross-bridge bus routes into SF" is awkward. "Bus routes into SF" is fine.

Commissioner Breen suggested on the pie chart; "101 Carpool" needs changing. Do not raise questions when you have the opportunity to provide an answer.

Public comment included: People will throw this away. It has to be something to catch the eye; start with a photo on the front page, of a traffic jam on Highway 101; "...Urgent, important information". When opened, people will immediately look at the pie chart; text should read "...Highway 101 Gap Closure" not carpool; don't use "...school access" use "... Safe Routes." Change "...local roads" to "...local infrastructure". Tie each one of the points in numerical fashion to the further explanations on the left. Concern about the language which references the poll; it may appear that the Authority can really fulfill the public's wishes, and thereby disappoint them. Regarding #1 should address "...elderly and disabled". #2, there should be language which states "... will recuperate these funds when Prop 42 is brought back into play again". Use just one big pie chart, indicating the numbers of the Strategies. Use "...maintain and enhance our local bus system".

Additional comments included the budget of the mail piece; it is \$16,000. MTC would commit up to \$25,000. Dave Hyams said the mail piece would reach frequent voters first. It will not be bilingual due to cost.

Commissioner Rose stated that this flyer is going to unincorporated areas, too for example, 37.5% of registered voters in her District are not living within a city jurisdiction, and to include "... the County" in the verbiage whenever possible.

Regarding graphic issues, Chairman Kinsey stated MTC did offer their graphic support; staying within our budget is critical. Mr. Hyams said we can add graphics at the expense of words, we can take out the "... Transportation Authority created" section. People are interested in the content, not the process. Dave Hyams cautioned against looking "campaign-oriented".

3. Draft Fact Sheet

Craig Tackabery reported this was provided for information and requested member to E-mail or call comments in to him.

4. Draft Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's)

Craig Tackabery reported this was provided for information and requested member to E-mail or call comments in to him.

8) Open Time For Items Not On The Agenda

Public comment included: Mr. Schoenbrunn requested the cost of providing transit service for the last year on which we have data. People need to have a handle on how much they can expect. Deb Hubsmith announced that May is National Bike Month; May 20th is Bike To Work Day; participate!

Bonnie Nelson thanked her assistant, Kara Vucich for her contribution to this Plan and process. She is now going on maternity leave.

Commission Chairman Kinsey adjourned the Joint Meeting at 10:35p.m